



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The work is concluded by a very valuable and complete bibliography, a complete *index locorum* and an *index rerum et verborum*, not quite so complete as the fullness of the commentary would seem to demand.

Where so much is given it would seem ungrateful to complain of the omission of anything, and probably what I have in mind does not properly fall within the sphere of an edition. But where such fullness has been aimed at and attained, it might not seem unfair to have expected in the Prolegomena some discussion of the *Dialogus* as a literary work and of its place in the history of Roman literature. For while the student who has read widely will doubtless know it, to the more casual reader it would have been a service to point out the unique position of the *Dialogus* as a work of literary criticism: to have called attention to the fact that, in spite of imitation of Ciceronian phraseology and dramatic motives, it is an original work of first magnitude—indeed, the most original specimen of literary criticism that Latin antiquity has handed down to us. For where else in ancient literary judgments shall we find what we call the historical point of view—the realization that literature is a part of life and dependent upon social and political conditions and changes? This thought has become so commonplace with us that we are in danger of failing to distinguish between the clearness of historical vision which characterizes the criticisms of Tacitus (especially from ch. 36 on—Maternus) and the technical standpoint of Quintilian. Quintilian, we can imagine, would have guaranteed to restore the eloquence of the republic, if he could but reform the false teaching of his day, but Tacitus knew better than that. Not that Tacitus was uninfluenced by Quintilian, for somehow, whether directly or indirectly, he was familiar with his teachings, but he transfused the data derived from them with historical insight. Hence the seemingly anomalous circumstance (and so also in relation to Cicero) of producing a work which betrays dependence in detail, but a much larger independence. But it is ungracious to complain of omissions where so much is given, and for this and every other question pertaining to the *Dialogus*, Professor Gudeman's edition furnishes abundant material. It is unfortunate that the nature of things requires us to be briefer in praise than in dissent, but it will, I may trust, be understood that my appreciation of the whole work is not less grateful and hearty because in many places I am unable to share the editor's views. The work is an enduring monument to the scholarship and devotion of the editor, and deserves to be widely circulated.

Jan. 15, 1895.

GEORGE L. HENDRICKSON.

The Stanford Dictionary of Anglicised Words and Phrases, edited for the Syndics of the University Press by C. A. M. FENNELL, D. Litt. Cambridge, At the University Press, 1892.

This valuable dictionary should have been noticed sooner, but *vita brevis, longa ars*, and no one has yet discovered the art of compressing into a short life all that one wishes to do. The late Mr. J. F. Stanford left to the University of Cambridge, in 1882, £5000 for the production of a dictionary of "Anglicised Words and Phrases," for which Mr. Stanford had made many notes and collections. He had himself interpreted the term 'Anglicised' to

mean (a) words "borrowed and wholly or partly naturalised"; (b) "used in English literature without naturalisation"; (c) "familiarised by frequent quotation," as in the phrase above given, which is traced to Seneca, *De Brevit. Vit. 1*, with slight transposition. When the University accepted this bequest, the Syndics of the Press appointed a committee, on which were Profs. Mayor, Skeat and Bensly, Mr. Aldis Wright, and Dr. Postgate, to draw up a scheme for their guidance, which is as follows, examples excluded:

"1. All words and phrases of non-European origin found in English literature, if borrowed *directly* (with or without change of sound or form) from non-European languages.

"2. All Latin and Greek words which retain their original form, and all Latin and Greek phrases, in use in English literature.

"3. All words and phrases borrowed directly from modern European languages excepting French.

"4. All words and phrases borrowed from the French which retain the French pronunciation.

"5. All words borrowed from French, Latin, and Greek, since the introduction of printing, whether now altered or but imperfectly naturalised and now obsolete.

"The work shall not professedly include dialectic forms."

Where we have such a comprehensive scheme, for which we should be truly thankful, it seems ungracious to ask for more, but if the time-limit in No. 5 could have been put at the Norman Conquest, which would practically have carried the labor back not more than two hundred years (for the first half of the period was not prolific in such words), we should have had a complete dictionary of the Romance side of the language in brief. However, we are grateful for what we have, and are not disposed to complain. As it is, the dictionary and supplement (it is unfortunate in dictionaries that there should be need for supplements, but it cannot be helped, I suppose) contain 12,798 articles, which treat of 13,018 words and phrases, and 2708 cross-references. The 12,798 articles are concerned with 10,927 words, 1873 phrases and 278 quotations, proverbs or maxims. 13,000 words and phrases seem a small number for such a scheme, but derivatives are excluded, which saves labor and space, and reduces greatly the number of words.

A criticism to which I think the dictionary is justly liable is the lack of any key to the pronunciation. The nearest approach to such a key is the system of accentuation adopted, which the editor describes as follows: "The accentuation of naturalised words has been approximately indicated by using - to represent an unaccented syllable, ' to represent an accented syllable," to represent a comparatively strongly accented syllable. If the mark ' or " be repeated with regard to the pronunciation of one word, it is not implied that the two stresses are quite equal, nor is it implied that all syllables marked as unaccented have precisely the same stresslessness." Now, it seems to me that even in such a system it would have been better to use the breve (˘) instead of the macron (—) to mark an unaccented syllable, or to leave it unmarked; but if the system of pronunciation of the New English Dictionary had been adopted, it would have added to the usefulness of the work.

As to the general execution of the work, it seems to me (I speak with becoming humility) to be as well done as could have been expected. Some

omissions have been noticed, and examples have not been brought chronologically as far as might sometimes be desired, but much labor has been spent on the work, and the result, on the whole, is very satisfactory.

Acknowledgments are made to the New English Dictionary, our standard as far as published, "up to *Cass*," to Prof. Skeat's, Cassell's and the Century Dictionaries. The last might have been consulted with advantage in respect to more words, for some have been omitted which are there included, as, for example, *picayune* and *lagn(i)appe*, the former used all over this country, and the latter among the Creoles of the South. *Per contra*, the Century omits the interjection *Caramba!*, also common among the Spanish Creoles, which the Stanford gives.

The etymology has been limited "to the indication of the language from which a word or phrase has been borrowed and of its native form and meaning, unless there was some fresh light to be thrown upon a derivation." Our attention is, however, called to some etymologies, and we are told that the assignment of a word to its native tongue supported by the illustrative quotations often corrects current derivations. "So far, so good"; but while this might answer for some, it would not do for others who wish more exact information, and we should have liked to see greater attention paid to etymology, as in the N. E. D. As our attention has been called to *Abracadabra* as one of the words on which 'fresh light' has been thrown, we may compare the articles in the N. E. D. and the Stanford. The former gives "[L.; origin unknown. Occurs first in a poem by Q. Severus [read Serenus] Sammonicus, 2d c.]." After the definitions, examples are quoted, of date 1696, 1810, 1824, 1860, 1879. The latter gives the definition and the usual triangular arrangement of the letters, quotations from 1565, 1584, 1657, 1684, 1711, 1840, 1883, and the following etymological note: "[For first known mention, see quot. fr. Mather [i. e. 1684], in which Sammonicus is mentioned as using *Abrocadara*, but S. is mentioned earlier in the quotation from Calhill, 1565. Severus in N. E. D. should be Serenus. According to C. W. King, Talism. and Amul., in Early Christ. Numism., p. 200, corrupted from Heb. *ha-b'rākāh dabbērāh*, = 'pronounce the blessing' (i. e. the sacred name).]" We see here an improvement upon the N. E. D., and a reasonable etymology given for the first time in any dictionary, as far as I know. The Century has merely "[L.; occurring first in a poem (*Præcepta de Medicina*) by Q. Serenus Sammonicus, in the second century: mere jargon. Cf. *abracalam*.]" Neither Webster, Worcester, nor Stormonth ventures on any etymology, but the last adds to the definitions "an oriental deity" (!). Skeat omits the word, as he does so many others that one searches his dictionary for in vain. The latest, so-called 'Standard' has: "The word is said to be from *Ab*, *Ben*, *Ruach*, *Acadosch*, Hebrew for Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." This recalls the antediluvian period in etymology, when it was sufficient to guess at part of a word, and understand (i. e. *supply*, not *comprehend*) the rest. It is evidently taken from the example in the N. E. D. under "1860, T. A. G. Balfour," q. v., but Dr. Murray did not endorse that fanciful etymology. If we go to the German and French dictionaries, we receive no further light. Grimm (*erste Lieferung*, 1852) gives no etymology, and defines simply as "*unverständliche beschwörungsformel*," with two examples from Goethe. The dictionary of the French

Academy (6th ed., 1835) and Poitevin (1860) give no etymology, but the latter adds an example from Victor Hugo. Littré (1885) gives the same example from Victor Hugo, and says: "Proprement *abrasadabra*, car en grec il s'écrit ABPACAΔABPA. On fait venir ce mot de l'hébreu *ab*, père, *ruah*, esprit, et *dabar*, parole. D'après cette etymologie, il designerait la Trinité. Grotefend (*Ersch und Gruber's Encyclopaedie*) le regarde comme composé du mot persan *abrasas*, dénomination mystique de la divinité, et de l'hébreu *dabar*, parole, parole divine."

But here we have a mixture of Aryan and Semitic, unless *abrasas* is an Arabic word incorporated into Persian, *s* softened from *k* (?). Cannot some Semitic scholar untie the knot, and justify Mr. King's etymology? We fail to see why a Hebrew should invoke the Trinity, as in Littré's explanation and Balfour's example, but with King's explanation it becomes clear. We do not find in either the N. E. D. or the Stanford the suitable example from Defoe's 'History of the Plague' (quoted in my 'Selections in English Prose,' p. 377), although the Stanford gives a contemporary one from the 'Spectator.' *Abracalam*, of similar import, is omitted in both of these dictionaries, though given in the Century and defined as "A cabalistic word used as a charm among the Jews," but without etymology. It is found in the Supplement to the Dictionary of the Academy (1856) as "*Abracalan*. Terme mystérieux auquel les juifs attribuent la même vertu qu'à *Abracadabra*. Selon Selden ce mot renferme les noms d'une déesse syrienne." Here I think we have traced to its source the idea of the "oriental divinity," which also appears in Adler's German dictionary, s. v. *Abracadabra*, as "name of a Syrian divinity." Is it as mistaken in the one case as in the other, and is Selden responsible, after all?

But the trail has carried me too far, and I must cut short this notice. I had wanted to note, with examples, "haro, sb.: Fr.: hue and cry. 1803 Macdonnel, *Dict. Quot.*" This is all that Dr. Fennell gives, but this word is the same as Middle English *harrow(e)*!, very common in The Mysteries, and so it should be excluded under No. 5, as it was in use before "the introduction of printing." Stratmann gives the form *haro*, "O. Fr. *haro*, *harou*," with examples from the Ayenbite of Inwyt, The Towneley Mysteries, Chaucer and Langland. If *haro* is rightly included, *orange* should have found a place, as it is traced back to Persian *nāranj* (see Century Dictionary), Spanish *naranja* retaining the *n*, but O. F. *orenge* having lost it. This is the earliest form in English too, the first example given by Stratmann being from 'Cleanness': "As *orenge* & oþer fryt & apple garnade" (Morris's E. E. Alliterative Poems, c. 1360, II 1044). It occurs as *oronge* in the Promptorium Parvulorum, c. 1440. Having come from Persian through Old French, it would, however, be excluded under No. 5. In some cases the earliest examples of the uses of words are taken from the N. E. D., but in others we find earlier examples in the Stanford, so that this work cannot be neglected even by Dr. Murray. However, it seems that no dictionary can keep pace with the language, for while the collection of phrases in the Stanford is excellent—indeed, one of the strong points of the work—we do not find the upstart *fin de siècle*.

A useful addition to the dictionary would be a list of the full titles of the works read, from which examples have been taken, with author and date, for while these can generally be identified in the abbreviations, this is not always the case, and it would be convenient to have a reference-list of them all together.

Now, when so much more attention is paid to lexicography than ever before, this work will prove a serviceable addition to the resources of the language in that department, for it is no mere compilation, but a large number of works have been read specially for this dictionary, and most of the examples are cited at first hand. It is no disadvantage that dialectic forms are excluded, for we are soon to have an 'English Dialect Dictionary,' edited by Prof. Joseph Wright, of Oxford, which will cover the whole ground.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Edited by Dr. J. A. H. MURRAY. Everybody-Ezod (Forming part of vol. III). By HENRY BRADLEY. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1894.

The publication of this small part of the New English Dictionary completes the letter E, which has been wholly edited by Mr. Bradley, while Dr. Murray is responsible for D, which "is now passing through the press," and these two letters will form vol. III. A very recent circular informs us that "the Delegates of the Clarendon Press have been urged from many quarters to consider the more frequent publication of the subsequent portions of the work in smaller instalments, as each is completed by the editors," and they "have arranged for the punctual issue of the letters D and F in *Quarterly Sections*." The circular states that the first sections of each of those letters will be issued on Nov. 15—they have just (Jan. 1) come to hand—and that "from and after Jan. 1, 1895, one section at least of each letter, consisting of 64 pages, will be published quarterly." F and G will be edited by Mr. Bradley, H, by Dr. Murray. It is gratifying to know that the publication will proceed hereafter more rapidly and regularly, as this has been the chief drawback to the great undertaking. Those of us who are now in middle life would like to see its completion, and under the hands of the present most competent editors. I should, however, prefer one thick part annually to four thin parts quarterly. It is ten years since the first part was issued, and four letters have just been completed, but at an average of two letters per year, one from each editor, the next ten years may see the completion. It is now more than forty years since the first part of Grimm's great dictionary was published, and it is not yet completed. Moreover, this is a much fuller work than Grimm's dictionary.

There is no preface to this small part, so that we cannot give any statistics, which some may not regret. Although Mr. Bradley says under *Everybody*, "Sometimes incorrectly with *pl. vb.* or *pron.*," the usage certainly has "the rime of age." The very first example, from Lord Berners (*c.* 1530), is "Everye bodye was in *theyr* lodgynges"; so Sidney (1580), "that everie body might come and take *their* meat freely"; Horae *Subsecivae* (1620), "To take upon him the disciplining of every body for *their* errors"; De Foe (1725), "*Do* not everybody else love him?"; Bp. Warburton (1759), "Every body else I meet with *are* full ready to go of *themselves*"; Byron (1820), "Everybody does and says what *they* please"; Ruskin (1866), "Everybody seems to recover *their* spirits." There are five other examples, in four of which no verb or pronoun occurs with *everybody*, and the fifth is from Bp. Berkeley (1720), "Time, place, and motion . . . are what every body knows"; but Byron and Ruskin too use